



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,001	09/07/2000	Erez Halahmi	G01/4	1829

7590

03/31/2004

Dr. D Graeser LTD
c/o The polkinghorns
9003 Florin Way
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,001

Applicant(s)

HALAHMI ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11 and 13-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment (Paper # 4) filed on January 27, 2004. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-18 remain pending. Claims 7 and 12 have been cancelled. Claim 19 has been added.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-19 are presented for further examination.

Drawings

3. The corrected drawing for figure 1 was received on January 27, 2004. The drawings are now acceptable.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 2143

6,684,088. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both recite analogous methods for helping to display e-mail messages on low bandwidth devices by separating the e-mail message into portions.

For example, claim 1 of the present invention calls for retrieving and downloading an attachment, after which, a message is prepared containing a link to the second portion, sent to the client and displayed. The user then can request the second portion, upon which it is decoded and sent to the client. Claims 1-21 of U.S. 6,684,088 recite an analogous method which provides an e-mail message with an attachment, upon which the message is divided into a plurality of portions. A first portion, sent to the client, contains navigation options, one of which is a link to request another portion, i.e. attachment. In addition, the decoding is performed on the e-mail message. While U.S. 6,684,088 does not explicitly recite retrieving the message from the server and downloading the attachment, these limitations are obvious in order to retrieve and view an attachment and e-mail message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to download and retrieve messages and attachments from a server in order to be able to view them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2143

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 14-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pollack (U.S. 6,505,236).

With respect to claim 14, Pollack teaches a system for selectively downloading a multi-part e-mail message for a user, the multi-part e-mail message including at least one attachment, the attachment being encoded, the system comprising:

- a. An e-mail server for receiving the multi-part e-mail message [**Pollack -- Figure 1 (receiving portal) and Col. 4 lines 3-7**];
- b. An e-mail proxy in communication with said e-mail server for receiving at least attachment information about the multi-part e-mail message [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 17-19 -- Handle generator receives file name and location, i.e. attachment information, of attachment**], and for preparing a formatted message containing a link to the attachment [**Pollack -- Figure 2 items 104 and 112, Col. 4 lines 27-29, Col. 5 lines 19-22 and 28-32 and Col. 7 lines 7-11 -- Proxy, generates handle information, i.e. link, from attachment information and formats message to include e-mail body and handle, i.e. link**]; and
- c. An e-mail client in communication with said e-mail proxy for receiving said formatted message and for displaying said formatted message to the user [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 44-45 -- User downloads message for the purpose of viewing mail item on his device**], such that the attachment is displayed to the user after the user selects said link

Art Unit: 2143

[Pollack -- Col 5 lines 17-22 and lines 47-50 – User downloads message using e-mail client, views appended message, and can view attachment by clicking on link].

With respect to claim 15, Pollack further teaches wherein said e-mail proxy downloads the attachment with said attachment information **[Pollack -- Col. 4 lines 3-7 and Col. 5 lines 17-19 – Attachment is downloaded, which is used to get information, i.e. from header, to append to e-mail message as handle, i.e. link. Attachment information, such as filenames, comes from the header of the file, i.e. attachment. This is obvious as the content header for an attachment contains information, such as filename, etc.]**.

With respect to claim 17, Pollack further teaches wherein the multi-part e-mail message contains a text-part, and said formatted message includes said text-part **[Pollack -- Col. 1 lines 59-62 and Col. 5 lines 30-32 – Appended message contains handle and e-mail body without attachment]**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2143

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack (U.S. 6,505,236) in view of Pizano et al. (U.S. 6,105,055).

Regarding claim 1, Pollack teaches the invention substantially as claimed, selectively downloading a multi-part e-mail message to an e-mail client operated by a user from an e-mail server, the multi-part e-mail message including at least one attachment [**Pollack -- Abstract**], the attachment being encoded, the method comprising:

retrieving said at least one attachment information for the multi-part e-mail message from the e-mail server [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 17-19 -- Handle generator receives file name and location, i.e. attachment information, of attachment**];

downloading said at least one attachment of the multi-part email message from said email server [**Pollack -- Figure 1 (receiving portal - 12), Figure 2 item 102, Col. 4 lines 5-8 and Col. 7 lines 1-3 -- Mail storage system receives e-mail message from e-mail server along with the attachment**];

preparing a formatted message for sending to the e-mail client, said formatted message containing a link to at least one downloaded attachment, such that the attachment is not sent to the e-mail client [**Pollack -- Figure 2 items 104 and 112 and Col 5 lines 19-22 and 28-32 -- Formatted message, containing link to downloaded attachment, is created without including the stripped attachment**];

sending said formatted message to the e-mail client [**Pollack -- Figure 2 item 112, Col. 5 lines 30-32 and Col. 7 lines 7-11 -- Formatted message is sent to recipient without attachment**];

Art Unit: 2143

displaying said formatted message to the user by the e-mail client [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 44-45 – User downloads message for the purpose of viewing mail item on his device];**

requesting said at least one attachment by said e-mail client [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 47-50 – Once formatted message, i.e. appended electronic mail item, is downloaded, user can choose to download attachment by clicking on the handle, i.e. link]; and**

sending said requested attachment to said e-mail client [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 54-56 and 61-67 – Attachment can be downloaded in a streaming format to user from the system/server acting as an intermediary storing the attachment].**

Pollack fails to teach decoding the attachment.

Pizano, however, teaches a delayed conference manager which downloads the e-mail and decodes the attachments [**Pizano -- Col. 4 lines 46-47 – Attachment in E-mail message is decoded before user is allowed to view attachment].**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the decoding of mail items, i.e. e-mail and attachments, as taught by Pizano into the invention of Pollack, in order to ensure that the user will be able to view the attachment by having the server decode it rather than relying on each machine hopefully having the ability to decode the attachment.

Regarding claim 2, Pollack-Pizano further teach wherein said attachment information includes the entirety of the multi-part e-mail message [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 28-36 – Handle, i.e. attachment information, along with rest of message, excluding attachment, makes up the appending electronic mail message, i.e. formatted message],** such that said preparing a

Art Unit: 2143

formatted message [Pollack -- Figure 2 items 104 and 112 and Col 5 lines 19-22 and 28-32 – **Formatted message, containing link to downloaded attachment, is created without including the stripped attachment**] further comprises the separating the multi-part e-mail message into a plurality of portions, including at least a first portion containing the attachment [Pollack -- Figure 2, Col. 4 lines 25-29 and Col. 7 lines 3-4 – **Entire mail message is retrieved from server upon which it is parsed, extracting the attachment from the message, i.e. separated**].

Regarding claim 3, Pollack-Pizano further teach wherein the multi-part e-mail message includes a text-part, such that said preparing a formatted message further comprises the separating the multi-part e-mail message into a second portion containing said text-part [Pollack -- Col. 1 lines 59-67, Col. 4 lines 25-29 and Col. 7 lines 3-4 – **After attachment is detached, i.e. separated, the body of the e-mail, i.e. text portion or second portion, remains**], and wherein said preparing a formatted message includes adding said second portion to said formatted message [Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 28-32 and Col. 7 lines 7-11 – **Appended mail item includes handle, i.e. link to attachment, and text/body of original mail message, i.e. second portion**].

Regarding claim 4, Pollack-Pizano further teach wherein said requesting said at least one attachment by said e-mail client further comprises selecting said link by the user from said formatted message [Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 17-22 and 47-50 and – **Once formatted message,**

Art Unit: 2143

i.e. appended electronic mail item, is downloaded, user can choose to download attachment by clicking on the handle, i.e. link].

Regarding claim 5, Pollack-Pizano further teach wherein said downloading at least one attachment from said email server for viewing by the user is performed in a streamed manner **[Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 61-67 – Attachment can be downloaded in a streaming format to the recipient].**

Regarding claim 6, Pollack-Pizano further teach:

providing a Web browser for interacting with the user **[Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 56-59 – User accesses attachment retriever via web browser]; and**

displaying said attachment by said Web browser, such that said downloading said attachment is performed according to HTTP **[Pollack -- Col. 56-67 – Attachment is downloaded using browser, which obviously uses the well-known and widely used HTTP and HTML services, to access server and retrieve/view attachment in browser window].**

Regarding claim 8, Pollack-Pizano further teach wherein said attachment information is a header for the attachment **[Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 17-19 – Attachment information, such as filename, come from the header of the file, i.e. attachment. This is obvious as the content header for an attachment contains information, such as filename, etc.].**

Regarding claim 10, Pollack-Pizano teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein said downloading said attachment from said email server includes decoding said attachment **[Pizano -- Col. 4 lines 46-47 – Attachment in E-mail message is decoded before user is allowed to view, i.e. download, the attachment].**

Regarding claim 11, Pollack-Pizano further teach the method further comprising:
downloading said attachment from proxy to client in a streamed manner for viewing by the user **[Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 61-67 – Attachment can be downloaded in a streaming format to user from the system/server acting as an intermediary, i.e. proxy, storing the attachment].**

Regarding claim 13, Pollack-Pizano further teach wherein said retrieving at least one attachment information from said multi-part email message includes providing an e-mail proxy for communicating with the e-mail server and with the e-mail client, such that said retrieving said attachment, said downloading said attachment, said preparing said formatted message and said sending said formatted message are performed by said e-mail proxy **[Pollack -- Figure 1 and Col. 4 lines 3-7, Col. 5 lines 28-36 and Col. 7 lines 1-11 – Intermediary system, i.e. proxy, contains receiving portal for receiving and storing the message, which includes retrieving and downloading the attachment, preparing the formatted message, i.e. appended electronic mail message, along with transmitting portal for sending the appended message to the client without the attachment].**

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 18, Pollack teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 14 above, but fails to teach wherein the e-mail proxy downloads and decodes the attachment before it is sent to the e-mail client.

Pizano, however, teaches this limitation substantially as claimed, wherein the e-mail proxy downloads and decodes the attachment before it is sent to the e-mail client [**Pizano -- Col. 4 lines 46-47**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the decoding of mail items, i.e. e-mail and attachments, as taught by Pizano into the invention of Pollack, in order to ensure that the user will be able to view the attachment by having the server decode it rather than relying on each machine hopefully having the ability to decode the attachment.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack (U.S. 6,505,236) and Pizano et al. (U.S. 6,105,055), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Dowling et al. (U.S. 6,574,239).

Regarding claim 9, Pollack-Pizano teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claims 1 above, but fails to teach wherein said downloading said attachment from said email server is performed in parallel to said preparing a formatted message.

Dowling, however, teaches background downloading of data that will not be used until later

Art Unit: 2143

while other processes are occurring, i.e. in parallel to another process [**Dowling -- Col. 16 lines 9-12**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the parallel, i.e. background, downloading of data files, i.e. attachments, as taught by Dowling into the invention of Pollack-Pizano, in order to allow a user or system to continue to process other instructions while another process is occurring in the background, instead of waiting for another, non-critical, process to finish.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack (U.S. 6,505,236), as applied above in claim 14, in view of Slotznick (U.S. 6,011,537).

Regarding claim 16, Pollack teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 14 above, but fails to teach downloading the attachment separately from said attachment information.

Slotznick, however, teaches of downloading primary and secondary information containing information about a file before downloading the actual full file [**Slotznick -- Col. 26 lines 62-67 -- Col. 27 lines 1-5**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the downloading of file information before the actual file, as taught by Slotznick into the invention of Pollack, in order to reduce the wait time required by one process to continue running by downloading only the portion of information that process needs first.

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack (U.S. 6,505,236) in view of Ubowski (U.S. 6,618,758).

Regarding claim 19, Pollack teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for selectively downloading a plurality of portions but not an entirety of a multi-part e-mail message to an e-mail client operated by a user from an e-mail proxy [**Pollack -- Abstract**], the method comprising the steps of:

retrieving the multi-part e-mail message from an e-mail server [**Pollack -- Col. 5 lines 17-19 – Handle generator receives file name and location, i.e. attachment information, of attachment**];

separating said multi-part e-mail message into a plurality of portions [**Pollack -- Figure 2, Col. 4 lines 25-29 and Col. 7 lines 3-4 – Entire mail message is retrieved from server upon which it is parsed, extracting the attachment from the message, i.e. separated**];

parsing at least one header from said plurality of portions [**Pollack -- Col. 4 lines 40-67 – Parser processes the message to extract the recipient address which, as is well-known and obvious, is stored in a header of the e-mail message**];

preparing a formatted message by the e-mail proxy for sending to the e-mail client, said formatted message containing said plurality of portions but not the entirety of said multi-part e-mail message [**Pollack -- Figure 2 items 104 and 112 and Col 5 lines 19-22 and 28-32 – Formatted message, containing link to downloaded attachment and message body, i.e. text,**

Art Unit: 2143

is created without including the stripped attachment. This constitutes a portion of the message but not it's entirety because the attachment is not included]; and

sending said formatted message to said e-mail client [Pollack -- Figure 2 item 112, Col. 5 lines 30-32 and Col. 7 lines 7-11 – Formatted message is sent to recipient without attachment].

Pollack fails to teach that a preference is used to determine which information to parse/transmit. However, as stated above, Pollack does teach parsing the header to extract information, i.e. recipient address.

Uowski, however, teaches a system for downloading portions of a file, i.e. information, based upon preferences set up by a user **[Uowski -- Col. 2 lines 1-4 and 12-16 and Col. 3 lines 35-38 – User selects and designates, i.e. a preference, which portions of a file to download].**

Both Pollack and Uowski are concerned with alleviating network traffic by not downloading unnecessary/undesirable files or portions of files.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the preferential downloading of files, i.e. information, as taught by Uowski into the invention of Pollack, specifically the parsing of header information, in order to give the user more control and allow them to select which portions get downloaded, which in turn, will alleviate wasted and unnecessary network traffic.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's arguments filed January 27, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant contends that Pollack is concerned with storing a message in any type of disk or on a network, whereas the present invention is concerned with speed of delivery of the message and with the amount of bandwidth used.

In response to argument A, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Claims are rejected based on the content of the claim, not on the invention's intended use. In addition, Pollack clearly states that the system will allow a user to quickly download e-mail message bodies [**Pollack -- Col. 1 lines 56-62**], i.e. speed of delivery, as the present invention also asserts.

- (B) Applicant contends that the attachment information of Pollack is retrieved after the file is downloaded, whereas the present invention downloads the attachment information optionally before the attachment.

As to point B, the applicant's argument with regards to downloading the attachment information optionally before the attachment does not commensurate with the claim language found in any of claims 1, 8, 14 or 15. Hence, this argument is not being considered.

- (C) Applicant contends the combination of Pollack and Pizano because both methods are geared towards the storage of data and further would not enable sending data in a streamed manner, whereas, applicant alleges the intended use of the present invention is to accelerate transmission rates and to save bandwidth by streaming attachments.

In response to argument C, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA

Art Unit: 2143

1963). Claims are rejected based on the content of the claim, not on the invention's intended use. In addition, Pollack does mention that the system will allow a user to download an attachment in a streamed manner [**Pollack -- Col. 1 lines 56-62**]. In order to stream an attachment download, it must be decoded by the system housing the attachment, as is taught by Pizano [**Pizano -- Col. 4 lines 46-49**]. Therefore, the combination would result in a system able to produce decoded streaming attachments which would allow a user to quickly download, i.e. speed the delivery of, an attachment.

- (D) Applicant argues that the background downloading of Dowling requires the user to be aware of such downloading, whereas applicant alleges present invention does not require user to be aware of such downloading.

In response to argument D, Slotznick, regardless of whether the user is aware of the background downloading, performs background downloading of information. Claim 17 does not recite any limitation other than "background downloading. The applicant's argument with regards to when or how background downloading occurs does not commensurate with the claim language found in claim 17. Hence, this argument is not being considered.

Art Unit: 2143

- (E) Applicant argues that Pollack in view of Slotznick does not download information about the attachment separately from the attachment, whereas claim 16 of the present invention calls for downloading the attachment from the attachment information separately.

In response to argument E, Examiner respectfully disagrees to the argument because information about the attachment is downloaded separate from the actual attachment. Slotznick teaches that primary information along with a 4K file representing a portion of the secondary information [Slotznick -- Col. 26 lines 62-65]. In addition, this 4K portion may be downloaded before, simultaneously or immediately after the primary information [Slotznick -- Col. 26 lines 65-67]. The primary information along with the 4K file represent attachment information, which again is downloaded before the actual attachment [Slotznick -- Col. 26 line 67 – Col. 27 lines 1-5]. The primary information with the 4K file provide information about the attachment, including information about the contents of the file, i.e. thumbnail or preview. More importantly, thumbnails will contain underlying links to the location of the actual file on the server. This further provides attachment information which is downloaded separately and before the actual file or attachment. The Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion because Slotznick does show the attachment information is downloaded separately from the attachment.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TJM
March 22, 2004


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100